



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,457	04/01/2004	Martin Erdtmann	13913-194001/2004P00047 U	6402
32864 7590 01/26/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER LE, THU NGUYET T	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/815,457	ERDTMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu-Nguyet Le	2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,9-12,14-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,9-12,14-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action has been issued in response to amendment file November 17, 2006. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14-18, and 20 are pending. Claims 5-8, 13-19 are cancelled. Accordingly, this action has been made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 9, 10-11, 14, 15-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fritz et al. (US 6134552)

With respect to claim 1, Fritz discloses a method for maintaining a collection of documents comprising:

maintaining a collection of documents each of the documents represented by a unique logical information object (LOIO) (col.2 lines 15-19), one or more physical information objects (PHIOs) belonging to each unique LOIO (col.2 lines 31-32), each of the PHIOs containing a variant of the content of the document represented by the PHIO's respective LOIO (figure 2, block 208, col. 2 lines 34-35);

receiving a request for a first document in the collection and an entry context, the entry context specifying a respective value for each of one or more attributes (col. 2 lines 52, 58-59);

determining a suitable PHIO belonging to a first LOIO, the first document being represented by the first LOIO, the suitable PHIO having attribute values matching the context entry if such a PHIO belongs to the first LOIO (col. 2 lines 52-59), and if no such PHIO belongs to the first LOIO, the suitable PHIO having attribute values matching a derived context, the derived context being generated by one or more successive applications to the entry context of one or more successively selected maps selected from a plurality of maps, each application of a map mapping a first attribute value to a second attribute value in the entry context or a derived context (fig.3 block 310, col.7 line 18-19, col.9 lines 63-65, col.10 lines 37-40, col.11 lines 59-61); and

providing the suitable PHIO in response to the request for the first document (col.2 line 53).

Claim 2 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Fritz teaches the method wherein the request is through a hyperlink (figure 12, block 1204, column 10, lines 32-33).

Claim 3 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Fritz teaches the method wherein the attributes include one or more of a name of a component, a version of the component, a language or a country (figure 3, block 304-310, column 6, line 35).

Claim 9 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Fritz teaches the method wherein the application of a map changes a single attribute value or the application of a map changes a pair of attribute values attribute value (column 15, lines 4, 8-9, figure 9, block 916, "Phys. Obj., PDF, German", or figure 19, block 1902 to block 1904, "Language Version" and "Content Version"), the map providing a dimension in which neighboring relations with respect to an attribute or a combination of attributes are defined (figure 11, "Version Relation" and block 1112, 1114, 1116) .

Claims 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reason give above for claims 1, 2, 3, 9. The claims 10, 11, 14, which claim limitations of a computer program product, and the claims 15, 16, 17, 20, which claim limitations of a system, are substantially equivalent limitations to the claims 1, 2, 3, 9, which claim limitations of the method.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 4, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fritz et al. (US 6134552) in view of Goodisman et al. (US 2002/0083093).

Claim 4 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Fritz discloses the method wherein determining comprises:

returning a PHIO represented by the match (column 2, line 53).

However, Fritz does not disclose:

generating a sequence of contexts from the entry context, each context in the sequence of contexts specifying a respective value for each of the one or more attributes;

determining a match of the entry context to one of the contexts in the sequence;

In the same field of endeavor, Goodisman teaches a method for linking between objects wherein a pattern matcher obtains context information, performs word sequence analysis to a context, and determines a context ("a name") that is relevant to the given context ("a particular user") (paragraph [0055], lines 30-41).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method for the efficient management and storage of documents as disclosed by Fritz into method for creating dynamic associations or linking between objects as disclosed in Goodisman in order to enhance network connectivity between data and related information and services (paragraph [0003], lines 3-5). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make the aforementioned combination with reasonable expectation of success.

Claims 12, 18 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reason give above for claim 4. The claim 12, which claims limitations of a computer program product, and

the claim 18, which claims limitations of a system, are substantially equivalent limitations to the claim 4, which claims limitations of the method.

Response to Arguments

The specification has been amended to overcome drawing objection. The claims have been amended to overcome 101 rejections. Therefore, the drawing objection and 101 rejections have been removed.

Applicants' argument regarding 102(b) rejection based upon Fritz (on the newly amended claim) is not persuasive.

With respect to applicants' argument that Fritz does not disclose a derived context that is generated by application by mappings, examiner respectfully disagrees and refers applicants to the rejection supra. In Fritz's reference, there is the mapping for use in the context resolution in order to calls the appropriate file or object based on the attributes (col.7 lines 18-26). Additionally, there are format attributes (contexts) like GIF file, HTML file when the physical object 310 of logical object 302 in fig.3 does not contain specific format attribute. Context resolution mechanisms provide mechanism to pick up the document or object that best fits to the context out of both collections (col.9 lines 63-65).

Applicant's argument regarding 103(a) rejection that Goodisman do not disclose "generating a sequence of contexts" in claim 4 and a map to an entry context to generate a derived context as recited in amended claim 1, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Goodisman teaches the pattern matcher, in which keyword proximity or

sequence of word should be generated in order to determine the relevant object (para.[0055] lines 30-41). Sequence of word in Goodisman's teaching is equivalent to a sequence of contexts in the claim limitation. Moreover, Fritz also disclosed in fig.9 block 918 and fig.14 block 1414, a physical object with attribute English has a sequence context. A map to an entry context to generate a derived context is referred to above paragraph.

Accordingly, examiner strongly believe believes that a prima facie case has been clearly established with respect to the prior art rejection of the instant claims, given their broadest reasonable interpretation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu-Nguyet Le whose telephone number is 571-270-1093. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am-2:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Application/Control Number: 10/815,457

Page 8

Art Unit: 2169

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Thu-Nguyet Le
January 18, 2007

KBP



CHRISTIAN CHACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100